

REMARKS

Claims 4, 9 and 14 have been canceled. Thus, Claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-13 and 15 are currently pending in the present application, of which Claims 1, 5-8, 10-13 and 15 have been amended.

The reference numerals on pages 19-24 have been amended. Thus, the objection to the drawings is believed to be overcome.

The antecedent problems with Claims 5, 10, and 15, and the reference numeral problems in Claims 8 and 10 have been corrected. Thus, the claim objections are believed to be overcome.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 11-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to a non-statutory subject matter. Applicants respectfully traverse such rejection insofar as it might apply to the claims as amended herein.

The preamble of Claims 11-15 have been changed to "computer readable medium," as suggested by the Examiner. Thus, the § 101 rejection is believed to be overcome.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-2, 4-7 and 9-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Yao et al.* (US 2005/0232269). Applicants respectfully traverse such rejection insofar as it might apply to the claims as amended herein.

Claim 1 (and similarly Claims 6 and 11) recites "in response to a data packet from a first network arriving at a translation router, selecting an appropriate one of said plurality of translation templates from said translation template cache according to an incoming port number from which said data packet comes."

On page 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that the claimed selecting step is disclosed by *Yao* in paragraph 27, lines 11-15. In paragraph 27, lines 11-15, *Yao* teaches that in order "to send a message or frame from a Fibre Channel port to a Gigabit Ethernet port, the destination port needs to appear as a Fibre Channel port to the source port; and the source port needs to appear as a Gigabit Ethernet port to the destination port." In other words, *Yao* simply teaches that when sending a frame from a sender having a Fibre Channel port to a receiver having a Gigabit Ethernet port, the receiver port needs to appear as a Fibre Channel port to the sender port; and the sender port needs to appear as a Gigabit Ethernet port to the receiver port. Thus, *Yao* does not teach or suggest the claimed step of "selecting an appropriate one of said plurality of translation templates from said translation template cache according to an incoming port number from which said data packet comes" (emphasis added).

Because the claimed invention recites novel features that are not taught or suggested by *Yao*, the § 102 rejection is believed to be overcome.

CONCLUSION

Claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-13 and 15 are currently pending in the present application. For the reasons stated above, Applicants believe that independent Claims 1, 6 and 11 along with their respective dependent claims are in condition for allowance. The remaining prior art cited by the Examiner but not relied upon has been reviewed and is not believed to show or suggest the claimed invention.

No fee or extension of time is believed to be necessary; however, in the event that any addition fee or extension of time is required for the prosecution of the present application, please charge it against IBM Deposit Account No. 09-0456.

Respectfully submitted,



Antony P. Ng
Registration No. 43,427
DILLON & YUDELL, LLP
8911 N. Capital of Texas Hwy., suite 2110
Austin, Texas 78759
(512) 343-6116

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS